



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,940	05/10/2001	Debra Sue Caswell	8082M	5827

27752 7590 07/09/2003

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

HARDEE, JOHN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1751

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/852,940	CASWELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John R Hardee	1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,5-15,25-54 and 56-64 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,16-24 and 55 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>8</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Example 10 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner has not indicated how the claims define inventions that are independent or distinct. This is not found persuasive because the claims recite several percentage ranges for individual components, as well as a plethora of optional ingredients. If applicant does not believe that these ranges and ingredients define separately patentable inventions, the examiner respectfully requests that he be notified of this at once..

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

The claims have been searched and examined only to the extent that they read on applicant's elected composition, Example 10, found allowable by the examiner, and Example 11, found obvious by the examiner. Claims 2, 5-15, 25-54 and 56-64 are withdrawn from consideration by the examiner as being drawn to embodiments non-elected with traverse.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3, 4, 16-24 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacon et al., US 5,500,138. The reference discloses liquid and solid biodegradable, rinse-added fabric softening compositions with highly enduring substantive perfumes. While many of applicant's perfume limitations can be met by this reference, it is not clear what is in the perfume of Example 11, so the perfume limitations have been withdrawn from consideration. Compositions according to the invention comprise about 50-95% of biodegradable cationic fabric softening compound, which is preferably diester; 0.01-15% of an enduring perfume composition; up to 30% of

a dispersibility modifier and a liquid carrier (col. 2, lines 4+). Liquid compositions according to the invention comprise about 0.5-80% of quat, about 0.01-10% of perfume, up to 30% of dispersibility modifier and a liquid carrier. Water may be added, but amounts are generally low (col. 3, lines 40+. As water is optional, it would be obvious to formulate a nil-water composition. Suitable quats are disclosed at col. 3, lines 59+. The viscosity, phase transition and flash point limitations appear to be met because the recited chemical limitations have been met. The Office does not have the facilities to determine such. Note the diester quat at col. 6, line 32. Suitable dispersibility modifiers are of the form shown at col. 13, lines 43+. Regarding claim 24, applicant's specification does not make clear whether or not the composition of Example 11 is translucent or clear but, because this composition can be made by following the teachings of the reference, it would be obvious to make a clear or translucent composition if this composition is clear or translucent. Claim 55 is drawn to the intended use of a rinse added fabric softener, and therefore it does not define the invention over the prior art. This reference differs from the claimed subject matter in that it does not disclose a composition which reads on applicant's claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by applicants are suitable for inclusion in a surfactant composition. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Applicant's elected composition is allowable over the prior art of record.
6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior art of record is the Bacon et al. reference relied upon above. Nothing in this reference discloses or makes obvious the use of cyclohexane dimethanol as a solvent for a nil-water fabric softening composition.
7. Any prior art made of record and not relied upon is of interest and is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (703) 305-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 until 4:30. In the event that the examiner is not available, his supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta, may be reached at (703) 308-4708.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



John R. Hardee
Primary Examiner
July 2, 2003